UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,670	06/08/2005	Wolfgang Kossl	566/43619	8601
	7590 01/15/201 HORNBURG LLP	EXAMINER		
750-17TH STR	REET NW	STRIMBU, GREGORY J		
	SUITE 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-4675			PAPER NUMBER
			3634	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vrobertson@btlaw.com DocketingPAT-DC@btlaw.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Occurrence	10/522,670	KOSSL, WOLFGANG			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Gregory J. Strimbu	3634			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 Oc</u>	ctober 2009 and 22 June 2009				
	. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
·=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
ologod in accordance with the practice and in	x parte gaayle, 1000 G.B. 11, 10	0.0.210.			
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 5 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)    Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)					

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed January 28, 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the European Patent Publication No. 0 443 305 referred to therein has not been considered.

The information disclosure statement filed January 28, 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information in the Austrian Patent Publication 400 970 B has not been considered. Although the IDS filed January 28, 2005 indicates that an English abstract was filed for the 400 970 B reference, a copy thereof is not currently in the file.

### **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because the car body 4 is not shown in figure 1.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an

amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the freewheel (claim 1) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

Art Unit: 3634

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the legal phraseology "means" on lines 16, 17 and 24 should be avoided. On lines 1-2 "[t]he invention relates to" can be easily implied and therefore should be deleted. On lines 14-15, "but with a releasable fixing relative to a release device" is grammatically awkward and confusing. On line 20, "or similar" is confusing since it is unclear what the applicant is attempting to

Art Unit: 3634

set forth. On line 22, "closing magnet" is confusing since it is unclear whether or not the applicant is referring to the solenoid set forth above.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (I) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

The disclosure is objected to because it is unclear what documents comprise the specification. Note that the applicant filed a document on January 28, 2005 which includes the language "AMENDED PAGE" throughout the document. It is unclear if

Art Unit: 3634

said document was intended to be part of the specification. It is suggested that the applicant file a substitute specification to avoid confusion.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fink (US 6189265) in view of Weishar et al. (US 5083600) and Fort et al. (US 20050044979). Fink discloses a door actuator of rail vehicles comprising:

a spindle drive 12 and a freewheel 23, wherein the spindle drive has a spindle 12 that is connected with the freewheel 23 permitting rotation of the spindle in a direction corresponding to a closing direction of a door 1 and preventing the rotation of the spindle in a direction corresponding to an opening direction of the door (see column 4, lines 54-60),

a part of the freewheel 23 positioned away from the spindle being rotatably mounted but being releasably fixed with respect to a release device 25. Fink is silent concerning, *inter alia*, a contact pressure spring.

However, Weishar et al. discloses a door actuator of rail vehicles comprising:

a spindle drive 6 and a freewheel 16, wherein the spindle drive has a spindle 6 that is connected with the freewheel 16 permitting rotation of the spindle in a direction corresponding to a closing direction of a door;

a part of the freewheel 16 positioned away from the spindle being rotatably mounted but being releasably fixed with respect to a release device 19 by force of at least one contact pressure spring 24 in cooperation with a releasable coupling 20, 22, wherein the coupling 20, 22 is fixable in an open released position as shown in figure 5; and

wherein the releasable coupling is configured to operate by a linkage having a dead center position between a released position of the linkage as shown in figure 5 and a locked position of the linkage as shown in figure 3 and the linkage has a swiveling lever 33 which can be swiveled about a lever axis 34, wherein first arm 35 of the swiveling lever is connected to a drive device (not numbered, but comprising the chain as shown in figure 1), and a second arm 32 carries rollers 31 with an axis of rotation parallel to the lever axis as shown in figure 4, wherein the lever is configured to move a movable part 21 of the releasable coupling between the released and locked positions, and the dead-center position is reached when a connection plane between an axis of rotation of the rollers and the lever axis is parallel to the moving direction of the movable part of the releasable coupling;

the releasable coupling includes a toothed disc 21 (claim 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Fink with a releasable coupling, as taught by Weishar et al., to provide a simple construction (see column 1, line 66) and to increase the longevity of the clutch since the releasable coupling of Weishar et al. does not have friction discs to wear out.

Additionally, Fort et al. discloses a magnetic driving device 14.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Fink with a magnetic driving device, as taught by Fort et al., to enable a user to remotely control the release device.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 26, 2009 have been fully considered but they are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Strimbu whose telephone number is 571-272-6836. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Katherine Mitchell can be reached on 571-272-7069. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.